

REMARKS

Formal Matters

Claims 21-24, 45-49, 66-74, and 76-84 are pending in the instant application. Claims 21, 45, 71-73, and 81-83 have been amended. Support for the amendment to Claims 21 and 45 can be found, for example, but not limited by, FIG. 2 (paragraph 38), FIG. 2a (paragraph 46), and paragraphs 43-45. Dependent Claims 71-73 and 81-83 have been amended in accordance to the amendments made from the claim from which they depend. Claims 86 and 87 have been added. Support for the newly added claims can be found, for example, but not limited by, in paragraph 46. No new matter has been added.

In view of the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 21-24, 45-49, 66-74, 76-84, and 86-87, the only claims under examination in the instant application.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As set forth in the Office Action dated November 15, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 21-24, 45-49, 66-74, and 76-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for alleged obviousness. In making that rejection, the Examiner used cited references, which include Parthasarathy et al. (US 2003/0138779; hereafter Parthasarathy) and Ramstad et al. (US 2003/0228706; hereafter Ramstad) as the references used as the basis of the alleged obviousness rejections for independent Claims 21 and 45.

The Applicants respectfully submit that currently presented Claims 21-24, 45-49, 66-74, 76-84, and 86-87 of the instant application make the rejections under the cited art moot. For example, Parthasarathy teaches methods using partially coated anion exchange particles, either with a polyelectrolyte homopolymer material or a polymer having charged end groups. Ramstad teaches methods using particles that have a shell formed around the particles, which shell is an uncharged, or neutral polymeric material. In contrast, embodiments of methods of the instant application use various embodiments of ion-exchange materials that are coated with a polyelectrolyte copolymer material. Other aspects of the methods of the instant application are further described in the Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 filed with this Response.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of currently presented Claims 21-24, 45-49, 66-74, 76-84, and 86-87 of the instant application.

Double Patenting

The Examiner's rejections under double patenting are provisional. Applicants reserve their rights to make arguments when these rejections have been formalized.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact me at the telephone number listed below.

Fee Authorization

Should any extension of time and/or fee be necessary for the timely submission of this paper, such extension of time is hereby requested, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge **Deposit Account No. 01-2213 (order no. 5118US)**. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to this deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2008



Sally A. Swedberg, PhD
Reg. No. 53, 659
Agent for Applicants

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Customer Number: 22896
APPLERA CORPORATION
Applied Biosystems Group
Patent Department – M/S 432-2
850 Lincoln Centre Drive
Foster City, California 94404
TEL: 650-554-2863
FAX: 650-638-6677